

**From:** [Terry Patton](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed Standards for Life Sciences  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 09, 2016 11:10:11 AM

---

To whom it may concern,

Our High School Biology Department sent comments in last Fall regarding changes to the CLEs. I want to reiterate on some individually. "Develop and use models" is stated often. Providing examples of what you mean by "models" would be very helpful. How do you plan to assess the student's ability to use a model? Is their modeling going to be assessed on the EOC? I also felt a number of key concepts were not covered or at least insufficiently covered by the proposal. Cell transportation and the scientific method are two of those that need to be properly understood by students in biology at an introductory level. there is not a single standard regarding cell structures and function. Other than these few issues, the standards look appropriate for the grade level and cover the majority of key concepts of Biology. Thank you for your time!

Terry Patton  
Biology

**From:** [Katie Bishop](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Subject:** New State Standard Concerns  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 09, 2016 12:09:03 PM

---

Good Afternoon!

As a first grade teacher at Mid-Buchanan Elementary, my team has noticed a few concerns with the new outlined standards. Please note below the standards and our concerns:

1B.1.h - we feel as though this standard needs to be clarified and provide examples for true understanding of what is being expected.

3C.1.d - we feel as though this standard needs to be clarified and provide examples for true understanding of what is being expected. Also we feel as though this should be moved to second grade to to difficulty for first graders.

4A.1.b - Explain what various media sources are to be used and what techniques for each grade level you are expecting.

RF

3A.2.h - Introduce r controlled words (EX: er, ir, ur, ar, or)

3A.2.h - Use the r controlled pattern to decode words (EX: er, ir, ur, ar, or)

Writing

1B.1.a& 2B.1.b - remove the wording for paragraph and leave to writing on given topic. Currently is inconsistent with 2C.1 and 3A.1 which do not require paragraph writing. Paragraph writing is a more advanced writing skill that shouldn't be learned in first grade.

Thanks,  
Katie Bishop

**From:** [Nick Kremer](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#)  
**Cc:** [Grupe, Dixie](#); [Franklin, Melia](#); [Vandeven, Margie](#); [Shelli Adams](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed Missouri Standards  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 09, 2016 2:43:44 PM

---

To Whom it May Concern,

(I apologize for not providing this feedback by the requested deadline of Friday, March 4<sup>th</sup>... however, it is consistent with the feedback that I shared publicly at the October State Board of Education meeting and on the public survey that was conducted last December).

Though I sincerely appreciate the efforts made by both the original HB 1490 work groups and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to craft and refine improved Missouri Learning Standards, the “final” draft of these standards that is being presented for approval to the State Board of Education later this month represents a significantly flawed product that will cause considerable complications for local school districts and the students they serve.

The most significant problem with the proposed new standards in all 4 academic content areas is a lack of meaningful/sufficient alignment between the K-5 and 6-12 standards. This problem persists despite DESE’s recent efforts to repackage the various work group’s proposed standards into a new standardized format that attempts to illustrate a K-12 vertical progression. Unfortunately, the K-5 and 6-12 standards in each discipline represent inherent conflicting philosophical and organizational designs that will result in a genuine disconnect between elementary and secondary education in each content area and in students entering the 6<sup>th</sup> grade who are inadequately prepared for the rigor and content of the standards expected of them at that level and beyond. There will be no easy way for districts to remediate this problem and ensure their graduates are ready for the college, career, and civic demands of 21<sup>st</sup> century life without implementing their own local set of more rigorous and better organized K-5 learning objectives. Large districts like my own will (begrudgingly) choose to invest the resources needed to accomplish this work, but I worry that smaller districts will not have the necessary money or personnel to devote to these efforts and will inequitably suffer as a result.

Though a number of smaller problems also exist within each strand of standards, I specifically want to highlight a change in the proposed K-5 Social Studies standards that will have massive curriculum implications for local districts. Currently, 5<sup>th</sup> grade students in our state study US history/geography/social systems, 4<sup>th</sup> grade students study Missouri history/geography/social systems, and 3<sup>rd</sup> grade (and younger) study local history/geography/social systems. In our district, 3<sup>rd</sup> graders spend the entire year studying our city of Columbia and the surrounding Boone County. The proposed standards, however, would double the required time students spend investigating national history, requiring its study in both 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade, pushing down Missouri studies to 3<sup>rd</sup> grade, and condensing the study of local systems in the primary grades (which in our district, would force us to largely eliminate the study of our city/county). These changes would require all 2<sup>nd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> grade teachers across the state to learn to teach a completely new Social Studies curriculum, as well

as require districts to purchase new instructional resources for those grade levels since the current resources will no longer be developmentally appropriate if used with students at a lower grade level with lower literacy abilities. To put that change into a real-world context: in our district alone, this would require ~250 teachers to be trained to teach new curriculum that we would need to spend ~2000 hours creating and that we would need to spend ~\$500,000 dollar supporting in new instructional materials. That is a significant burden to assume (especially during tough economic times) – and it is a burden that does not promise any improvement in students’ Social Studies education. Students are already required to study US history/geography/social systems for a full year in 5<sup>th</sup> grade, a full year in 8<sup>th</sup> grade and at least a year in a half in high school, and there is no reason to think that spending another full year in 4<sup>th</sup> grade is going to meaningfully change their ultimate understanding of our country in new, profound ways. If anything, it is more likely that time will be wasted in redundancy over content coverage and they will lose the opportunity to adequately study their local communities as a result. Simply put: these changes would be unwarranted and highly disruptive.

Unfortunately, there is no easy way out of this standards dilemma. The standards review process put into law by HB 1490 is inherently flawed by its establishment of two autonomous work groups per content area instead of one cohesive K-12 group and by its bureaucratic appointment system that does not ensure appropriate teacher representation on the work groups and is highly susceptible to political manipulation rather than ensuring apolitical, merit-based appointments. To call for the original work groups to resume their work or to re-start the process with new work groups altogether would almost certainly yield similarly flawed results. However, authorizing an independent organization (like DESE) to radically revise the proposed standards drafted thus far in order to attain K-12 alignment and fix the related problems within them will almost certainly be highly scrutinized as an undemocratic affront to the process that overreaches the bounds of HB 1490 and usurps the autonomy of the work groups. From my perspective, the most responsible course of action at this time would be to uphold the Missouri Learning Standards as they currently exist and to ask the legislature to fix the flaws in HB 1490 so that a new process can eventually begin – one with the potential for success and that would ideally use the proposed revisions to the Missouri Learning standards developed by the HB1490 work groups as a starting place. Such a decision would preserve the stability of the existing system for Missouri students and educators rather than lead us down a path of uncertainty where our standards/assessments could undergo a persistent cycle of disruptive revision.

Thank you for considering my perspective and best of luck with your decision.

Sincerely,

Nick Kremer  
Coordinator of Language Arts 6-12  
Coordinator of Social Studies K-12  
Columbia Public Schools

**From:** [Kim Aitkens](#)  
**To:** [1490Comments](#); [Tim Roth](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed standards - ELA  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 09, 2016 2:58:53 PM

---

There is a concern that students are not mastering Parts of Speech by the end of elementary. In the proposed standards, there is not a place where parts of speech are mentioned for secondary. We are finding that we cannot focus on conventions at the secondary level, because there is so much teaching that still needs to be done. i.e. We cannot teach active and passive voice if students are not able to identify the verb in the sentence. We cannot teach subjective and objective case if students are unfamiliar with pronouns.

Is there a reason why there are no standards for parts of speech within the secondary section?

--

Kim Aitkens  
6th Grade Writing  
Southern Boone Middle School  
[quest.portaportal.com/kaitkens](http://quest.portaportal.com/kaitkens)  
*Clear Eyes Full Hearts Can't Lose*